

The overly restrictive earnings cap in the Social Security Act represents precisely the kind of unfair law and barrier to employment that Dr. Jernigan battled throughout his life. He knew first hand about the devastating impact that restrictions such as this could have on the aspirations and hope of blind persons already struggling to overcome tremendous challenges.

Congress itself has recognized the overly restrictive nature of this earnings cap. In 1996, we raised the cap for senior citizens with passage of the Senior Citizens Freedom to Work Act. However, the earnings limitation for blind individuals was left unchanged. Up until that point, for almost twenty years, the same earnings cap had applied to both senior citizens and blind persons under the Social Security Act. With passage of the 1996 Freedom to Work Act, seniors were encouraged to remain active and continue working, but the disincentive to work was unfortunately left in place for the blind. Consequently, by 2002, seniors will be permitted to earn up to \$30,000, but blind people who earn over \$14,800 (less than half as much) will lose their benefits.

There is no justification for raising the earnings cap for one group and not the other. Why should we distinguish between two groups that for over twenty years were treated even-handedly under the law? What has changed to cause us to discriminate between the two and encourage one to work while greatly limiting the opportunities of the other? By reestablishing parity in the treatment of blind persons and senior citizens under the Social Security Act, this legislation will restore fairness to this law and will remedy a policy that has kept the blind locked out of rewarding, self-fulfilling employment.

Although a small number of blind persons may become newly eligible for benefits as a result of this change, their number will be a mere fraction of the thousands who do not work because of the disincentive imposed by this earnings limit. By enabling these beneficiaries to work, the overall net effect of this bill will be to increase payments to the Social Security trust funds and bring additional revenue to the Federal Treasury as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation that will ensure the blind are treated fairly under the law and will empower thousands of blind beneficiaries to become more engaged in society through productive employment.●

TRIBUTE TO STUDENT VOLUNTEERS

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate and honor two young Oregonians who have received national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in their communities. Mr. Cody Hill of Portland and Mr. Quinn Wilhelmi of Eugene

have recently been named State Honorees from Oregon in the 1999 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on only one high school student and one middle-level student in each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Cody Hill, nominated by Lincoln High School, created and currently coordinates a program called "Guns Aren't Fun," a toy gun trade-in event to encourage kids to trade in their toy guns for other non-violent toys. His idea is currently being developed into a non-profit organization to spread the message of non-violence across the country. Due to Cody's hard work and determination, more than one hundred toy guns have been turned in during two trade-in events. Cody has worked closely with local non-profit organizations and, to date, he has collected over \$13,000 for the purchase of new toys. Cody has also received recognition in local newspaper detailing his volunteer work.

Mr. Quinn Wilhelmi, nominated by Roosevelt Middle School, began a tutoring program with fifth grade students in his former elementary school. Quinn's program works to develop the student's writing skills by helping them compose their autobiographies. Through his initiative, Quinn was able to recruit several of his classmates to join in this effort as well, and he has made a tremendous impact on several younger students while working as a writing mentor.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions these young people have made. Young volunteers like Cody and Quinn are inspiring examples to us all, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow. I applaud them for their initiative in seeking to make their communities better places to live, and for the positive impact that they had on the lives of others. In recognition of their efforts, Cody and Quinn will come to Washington, DC in early May, along with other 1999 Spirit of Community honorees from across the country. While in Washington, ten students will be named America's top youth volunteers of the year by a distinguished national selection committee.

I would also like to recognize four other young Oregonians who were recognized as Distinguished Finalists for their outstanding volunteer service: April Choate of Bend, Jennifer Fletcher of Portland, Julia Hyde of Portland, and Tiffany Wright of Springfield. They deserve high praise for their hard work and determination in helping others in their communities.

It is clear that these young people have demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary, and I believe they deserve our sincere admiration and respect. Their actions show that young

Americans can, and do, play important roles in their communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.●

IMPEACHMENT TRIAL PROCEDURES

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, with the impeachment trial now behind us, I wanted to take a moment to make a few comments about the process that we experienced and suggest some of the lessons that we learned. I hope that in the weeks and months to come, we can look back dispassionately and try to take advantage of those lessons to make some changes in the Senate's rules that might serve us well in future impeachment trials.

The process used in the impeachment trial in the Senate was imperfect, but this is not surprising. The only truly apposite source of precedents took place more than 130 years ago. The value of the Johnson procedural precedents has been undermined in part by the changes in our politics, our culture and our technology.

There are many aspects of the trial that history will undoubtedly look upon with favor. Chief Justice Rehnquist, a son of Shorewood, Wisconsin, presided fairly and with dignity. His few rulings were not challenged. Perhaps most important, he provided a steady hand with a dose of humor. We are all in his debt.

In addition, senators approached the trial with dignity and collegiality. At the moment of greatest tension between the advocates, good will among senators never faltered. I understand that this may, in part, be due to the fact that the ultimate outcome of this trial was never in doubt. Having said that, however, senators, really without exception, took their duties and each other seriously. The impeachment of a president is a painful process, and, as I will discuss further in a moment, it ought to be painful. The stakes were very high in this trial, yet the Senate remained a place of civility. This was in stark contrast to the impeachment process in the House of Representatives. I hope the relative harmony in the Senate restored to this process some of the legitimacy lost in the partisan din of the other body.

The House Managers and the President's counsel did well in their individual presentations. At the outset we senators caucused together and reached a fair, if imperfect, roadmap for the early stages of the trial. Ultimately, we agreed on a procedural course that took us through the verdict. The tone throughout was civil and the arguments, by and large, on point.

But we did tie the hands of the advocates in some ways, and perhaps denied ourselves the fullest possible presentation of the evidence and arguments. The trial consisted, except for the unusual, and not always helpful, question period, of opening arguments followed

by several iterations of closing arguments. These arguments were interspersed with video snippets from grand jury depositions and depositions by the House Managers. This arrangement, pieced together as we went along, did not always make for a coherent narrative.

The House Managers' theory of the case required us to accept a narrative, a story of conspiracy, lies and efforts to thwart justice. As they told the story, each sinister act was offered as evidence of the coherent whole. They had trouble telling a story, due partly to flaws in their theory and, to be fair, perhaps in small part due to flaws in our process. We had no live witnesses. The parties alternated control of the floor, creating a dynamic of thrust and parry, rather than a methodically constructed narrative.

The managers' complaints about the process in turn became a recurrent theme in their arguments, resulting in greater, and sometimes unfair, latitude for them in their efforts to make the case. For example, on a disappointing party line vote, the President was denied fair notice of the snippets of taped testimony that would be woven into the House Managers' arguments. Then the Senate allowed the House Managers to reserve two of their three hours of closing arguments for a "rebuttal" which included new iterations of their various accusations, with no opportunity for the defense to reply.

The question of witnesses was distorted on both sides by political considerations. The House Managers were counseled by their allies in the Senate not to seek too many witnesses, lest they unnerve Senators with visions of unseemly testimony on the floor. The President's defenders declared that no witnesses were necessary; they argued that the House Managers had passed up their chance to hear fact witnesses in the House Judiciary Committee hearings. Neither approach was sound—witnesses would have helped, but they should have been chosen and presented in a thoughtful way. I believe, for example, that Betty Currie was a very important potential witness. She was nowhere to be found, apparently because the managers made a political calculation that they would do without her testimony, trading away the strongest piece of their obstruction case.

In the end, both sides made strategic decisions in this trial at the mercy of a fluid and unpredictable procedure. That led to an element of chance in the trial that I believe was unfortunate. And it also led to complaints from each side about the fairness of the process that were a distraction from the substance of the trial. I therefore recommend to future presidential impeachment courts that at the very outset they try hard to achieve consensus on a procedure that will govern the entire trial.

The process was not only flawed in the procedure on the floor. In the midst

of the trial, the Independent Counsel, Kenneth Starr, at the behest of the House Managers, sought from the District Court an order compelling Monica Lewinsky to travel to Washington to submit to a private interview with the House Managers. This interposed the court and the Independent Counsel in matters properly reserved to the Senate, in which the Constitution vests the sole power to try impeachments. In so doing, he undermined the bipartisan agreement of the Senate that it would make procedural determinations regarding witnesses following the opening arguments and the question period.

Both the Republican and Democratic caucuses met throughout the trial to discuss the proceedings. I attended these meetings and I do not assert that they were improper, but we could have better lived up to our oath to do impartial justice, if we had not held those regular party caucuses. Those meetings must have seemed to some of our constituents to be the place where we plotted a partisan course. This could not have helped the people to have confidence in our work.

Time and again, we saw the House Managers and the President's lawyers clearly responding to advice from Senators. At times they held formal meetings with Senators. There were countless casual conversations about the case between Senators and the advocates for both sides. We are not solely jurors, in the traditional sense, but as triers of fact and law, we would do well in future impeachment trials to avoid these interactions, which really amount to ex parte communications.

The greatest flaw in the process was the lack of openness in deliberations. The modern Senate has no excuse for locking the people out of any of its proceedings except for the most serious reasons of national security. The Chief Justice ruled forcefully that the Senate in an impeachment trial is not a jury in the ordinary sense of the word. With that ruling, any pretext for closed deliberations was destroyed. We should quickly take steps now that the trial is over to change the archaic rules that forced this process behind closed doors at crucial moments. The American people should be able to watch us and hear us at every stage in a process that could lead to removal of a President they elected. Secrecy in these proceedings is wrong and can only undermine public confidence in this important constitutional event.

Mr. President, impeachment trials should be extremely rare. To make this more likely, the process of impeachment in the Senate should not be quick, convenient, and painless. Making it so only invites its further abuse. Adherence to a thorough process can provide a stabilizing bulwark against this kind of abuse. That is one of the reasons I opposed premature motions to dismiss the Articles of Impeachment and supported the House Managers' motions to depose witnesses and to admit those depositions into the

record. The hasty and abbreviated impeachment process of the other body helped contribute to a feeling of two armed encampments facing each other in a high stakes contest rather than a search for truth or justice. Whether a President is convicted or acquitted, no credible or politically sustainable result can possibly come from such a process.

I believe it is important for us to review and analyze the process by which we conducted this trial and look honestly and critically at what worked and what didn't. We should then make changes to the process, now, while the experiences of this trial are fresh in our minds, and hand down to the next Senate that faces the unfortunate task of mounting an impeachment trial rules and procedures that will help it conduct the trial in a manner worthy of the weighty constitutional duty that the Framers of the Constitution bequeathed to it.●

DRUG FREE CENTURY ACT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to join the distinguished Senator from Ohio and a number of my colleagues in supporting the Drug Free Century Act. This bill continues last year's efforts in the fight against drug use in our country in the form of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, the Drug Free Communities Act, and the Drug Demand Reduction Act, all of which I supported.

During my tenure in office I have read, listened to, and weighed the debate over illegal drug use and the policy our nation should follow in dealing with illegal drugs. In an attempt to put an end to that growing problem, I signed onto the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. This act was a bipartisan piece of legislation that authorized \$2.6 billion over three years for drug eradication and interdiction efforts designed to restore a balanced anti-drug strategy. It offered significant promises for the reduction of the supply of coca and opium poppy in Latin America, as well as improving intelligence and interdiction capabilities against the national security threat posed by major narcotics trafficking organizations.

Although this bill received bipartisan support and was signed by the President, the FY2000 anti-drug budget was cut by the Administration by almost \$100 million below that appropriated in FY1999. I ask you, Mr. President, what kind of signal are we sending to our nation's youth if we allow this to happen? We in Congress took the necessary steps last year in restoring a balanced, coordinated anti-drug strategy. We must continue our efforts and we must impress upon the Administration the commitment needed in order to carry out that strategy.

My colleague has pointed out that drug use and criminal activity since 1992 wiped out any gains made in the previous decade. America has witnessed an increase in illegal drug use